

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

MUSTAFA A. WHITFIELD,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civ. No. 06-512-GMS
)	
GLEN HOWELL, MAUREEN WHELAN,)	
and DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF)	
EDUCATION,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM

The plaintiff Mustafa A. Whitfield (“Whitfield”), a prisoner incarcerated at the Delaware Correctional Center, filed this lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He appears *pro se* and was granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. (D.I. 4.) The court now proceeds to review and screen the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and § 1915A. For the reasons discussed below, the complaint is dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and § 1915A(b)(1).

I. THE COMPLAINT

Whitfield alleges that he was enrolled in an Individualized Education Program (“IEP”) for special education services and was told he would receive a certain number of hours of tutoring per week. Whitfield alleges that he did not receive the tutoring and after he complained his IEP was revised. Whitfield alleges he was told that he did not receive personal tutoring because there were insufficient numbers of teachers. He was asked to again revise his IEP, and it was changed even though Whitfield did not agree to it. Whitfield alleges he “never received 1

minute of one-on-one help.” He complained to the Delaware Department of Education and it conducted an investigation and issued a report. Whitfield alleges the report contains incorrect information. Whitfield seeks compensatory damages to purchase books, for deprivation of an education, and for violation of his IEP rights.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

When a litigant proceeds *in forma pauperis*, 28 U.S.C. § 1915 provides for dismissal under certain circumstances. When a prisoner seeks redress from a government defendant in a civil action, 28 U.S.C. § 1915A provides for screening of the complaint by the court. Both 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and § 1915A(b)(1) provide that the court may dismiss a complaint, at any time, if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant immune from such relief.

Pro se complaints are liberally construed in favor of the plaintiff. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-521 (1972). The court must “accept as true factual allegations in the complaint and all reasonable inferences that can be drawn therefrom.” *Nami v. Fauver*, 82 F.3d 63, 65 (3d Cir. 1996)(citing *Holder v. City of Allentown*, 987 F.2d 188, 194 (3d Cir. 1993)). An action is frivolous if it “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact,” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989), and the claims “are of little or no weight, value, or importance, not worthy of serious consideration, or trivial.” *Deutsch v. United States*, 67 F.3d 1080, 1083 (3d Cir. 1995). Additionally, a *pro se* complaint can only be dismissed for failure to state a claim when “it appears ‘beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief.’” *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-521 (1972)(quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957)).

III. ANALYSIS

Whitfield alleges the defendants deprived him of an education. When bringing a § 1983 claim, a plaintiff must allege that some person has deprived him of a federal right, and that the person who caused the deprivation acted under color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988). Unfortunately for Whitfield, prisoners have no constitutional right to an education. *Canterino v. Wilson*, 869 F.2d 948, 952-54 (6th Cir. 1989); *Risso v. Dawson*, 778 F.2d 527, 530-31 (9th Cir. 1985); *Garza v. Miller*, 688 F.2d 480, 486 (7th Cir. 1982); *Longendorfer v. Roth*, No. 92-2180, 1992 WL 95919, at *1 (E.D.Pa. April 23, 1992). The claims as currently presented, lack an arguable basis in law or in fact and must, therefore, be denied pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and § 1915A(b)(1).

IV. CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing analysis, the complaint is dismissed without prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and § 1915A(b)(1) for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Amendment of the complaint would be futile. See *Grayson v. Mayview State Hosp.*, 293 F.3d 103, 111 (3d Cir. 2002); *Borelli v. City of Reading*, 532 F.2d 950, 951-52 (3d Cir. 1976). An appropriate order will be entered.



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

November 13, 2006
Wilmington, Delaware

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MUSTAFA A. WHITFIELD,

[illegible]

Civ. No. 06-512-GMS

ORDER

Memorandum issued this date, the complaint is DISMISSED without prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and § 1915A(b)(1) as legally frivolous. Amendment of the complaint would be futile.

